| 1  |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   |  |
| 3  |   |  |
| 4  |   |  |
| 5  |   |  |
| 6  |   |  |
| 7  |   |  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |  |
| 9  | Northern District of California   |  |
| 10 | Oakland   | d Division   |
| 11 | RICHTEK TECHNOLOGY CORP.,   | No. C 09-05659 WHA (LB)                                    |
| 12 | Plaintiff,  | NOTICE OF REFERRAL AND<br>ORDER RE DISCOVERY<br>PROCEDURES |
| 13 | V.  UPI SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., et al.,  |  |
| 14 |   | PROCEDURES   |
| 15 | Defendants/   |  |
| 16 | TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:   |  |
| 17 | The district court has referred Plaintiff's February 2, 2011 Letter, which is a discovery matter, to      |  |
| 18 | United States Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler.   |  |
| 19 | The court <b>DENIES</b> the pending discovery request without prejudice and directs the parties to        |  |
| 20 | comply with the procedures for addressing discovery disputes set forth in Judge Beeler's standing         |  |
| 21 | order (attached). Those procedures require, among other things, that if a meet-and-confer by other        |  |
| 22 | means does not resolve the parties' dispute, lead counsel for the parties must meet and confer in         |  |
| 23 | <b>person</b> . If that procedure does not resolve the disagreement, the parties must file a joint letter |  |
| 24 | instead of a formal motion. After reviewing the joint letter, the court will evaluate whether further     |  |
| 25 | proceedings are necessary, including any further briefing or argument.                                    |  |
| 26 | IT IS SO ORDERED.   | 1180   |
| 27 | Dated: February 7, 2011   | LAUREL BEELER  |
| 28 |   | United States Magistrate Judge                             |
|    |   |  |

C 09-05659 WHA (LB) NOTICE OF REFERRAL AND ORDER